



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

und der romanischen Kaiser, mannigfach verändert durch eine Entwicklungsgeschichte von zwei Jahrtausenden, aber in ihrem Kern die getreue Hüterin und Bewahrerin zum Teil uralten lateinischen Sprachgutes".

Latin is a dead language? Yes, the Latin of Cicero's period is linguistically dead—no deader, however, than when the artificial product was formed. There was, however, a living language and it will continue to live as long as the Romance world continues to speak, to prize, and to develop its ancient tongue.

I have ventured to append the titles of a few inexpensive books which I believe would prove intensely interesting to classical teachers that can devote some of their leisure to this most attractive phase of Latin study. The book of Professor Grandgent has a very full bibliography, and I have therefore restricted myself to works that have appeared since the publication of his volume. I can not recommend too highly the chapter entitled the Latin of the Common People in Professor Abbott's recent book, *The Common People of Ancient Rome*. It is an attractive outline by one of our greatest scholars in the field of popular Latin.

Grandgent, *Vulgar Latin*, 1907 (D. C. Heath and Co.).

Diehl, *Vulgärlateinische Inschriften*, 1910 (Kleine Texte für theologische und philologische Übungen, No. 62).

Diehl, *Pompeianische Wandinschriften*, 1910 (Kleine Texte, No. 56).

Diehl, *Lateinische-christliche Inschriften*, 1908 (Kleine Texte, 26-28).

Petronius, *Cena Trimalchionis*, ed. Heraeus, 1909 (Sammlung vulgärlateinischer Texte).

Proben aus der sogenannten *Mulomedicina Chironis*, ed. Niedermann, 1910 (Sammlung vulgärlatein. Texte).

Silviae vel potius Aetheriae Peregrinatio ad loca sancta, ed. Heraeus, 1908 (Sammlung vulgärlatein. Texte).

Kleine Texte zum Alexanderroman, ed. Pfister, 1910 (Sammlung vulgärlatein. Texte).

Antike Fluchtafeln, ed. Wünsch (Kleine Texte, No. 20).

Bourciez, *Éléments de linguistique romane*, 1910.

Zauner, *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*, 2nd ed. (Sammlung Göschen, Nos. 128 and 250).

Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft*, 2nd ed., 1909.

Stolz, *Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1910, Sammlung Göschen No. 492), particularly Chapters xii and xiii.

Abbott, *The Common People of Ancient Rome*, 1911 (Charles Scribner's Sons).

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES L. DURHAM.

REVIEW

The Plan and Scope of a Vergil Lexicon with Specimen Articles. By Monroe Nichols Wetmore. New Haven: Published by the Author (1904). Pp. 128.

Index Verborum Vergilianus. By Monroe Nichols Wetmore. New Haven: Yale University Press (1911). Pp. viii+534. \$4.00.

Lexicon zu Vergilius mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen. Von H. Merguet. Complete in 10 Parts. Leipzig: Richard Schmidt (1909-1912). Pp. 786. 50 Mks.

Professor Wetmore's pamphlet on *The Plan and Scope of a Vergil Lexicon* was his doctor's dissertation. He began by pointing out how recent special lexica to various authors were; their compilation sprang out of the preparation, in the last century, of the great modern critical editions. Next he gave a list of such lexica, as a preliminary to the discussion of the advantages and the disadvantages of the methods followed in them and the determination of the best method for a complete Lexicon to the Works of Vergil which it was his intention to publish within five years. This list, modified in some ways, it is worth while to reproduce here: H. Merguet, *Lexicon zu den Reden des Cicero* (Jena, 1873-1884: 4 volumes, 3500 pages); H. Merguet, *Lexicon zu den Schriften Caesar und seiner Fortsetzer* (Jena, 1886); H. Merguet, *Lexicon zu den philosophischen Schriften des Cicero* (1886-1894: 3 volumes); A. Gerber, A. Greef, G. John, *Lexicon Taciteum* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1877-1902: 64 Mks.); S. Preuss, *Vollständiges Lexikon zu den pseudocäsarianischen Schriftwerken* (Erlangen, 1884); H. Meusel, *Lexicon Caesarianum* (Berlin, W. Weber, 1884-1886: so Professor Wetmore; my copy, however, bears the dates 1887-1893, with nothing to show that it is a reprint or a second edition: 2 volumes, the second in two parts, 2430 columns in all, plus 108 pages of addenda); R. Menge, S. Preuss, *Lexicon Caesarianum* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1885-1890: 18 Mks.); F. Fügner, *Lexicon Livianum* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1889-1897: 8 fascicles, A—Bustum: 19.20 Mks.: discontinued after the publication of one volume); Ioannes Segebade, Ernest Lommatsch, *Lexicon Petronianum* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1898: 274 pages: 14 Mks.); J. P. Waltzing, *Lexique de Plaute* (Louvain, Charles Peeters, 1900: discontinued after the publication of two parts, pages 152, A-Adfero); G. Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1901-1911: 6 parts, pages 1-576, A-Fabula). To be added to this list are H. Merguet, *Handlexikon zu Cicero* (Leipzig, Theodor Weicher, 1905: 1 volume, 816 pages), a general lexicon covering all Cicero's works (the citations are, of course, not exhaustive); G. N. Olcott, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae*, *A Dictionary of the Latin Inscriptions* (Rome, Loescher, 1904-1911: 19 parts,

pages 1-456, A-Argentarius), interrupted by the death of the author early in 1912.

What is the value of such special lexica? In the first place, they give an editor complete control of the author's individual words, of the combinations of words he uses, and of his syntax. To be sure, no final and definitive lexicon can be prepared until the definitive edition of the text itself has been presented; yet the special lexicon is of prime assistance in the making of an edition, exegetical or critical. For example, is an editor of Plautus to emend, as Lindsay emends, Truc. 804, in such a way that the phrase *dono donare* shall appear in the text as Plautus's? Examination of Professor Lodge's Lexicon Plautinum shows that Plautus regularly says *dono dare*: we answer our question at once in the negative. Suppose one should undertake to write a dissertation on Vergil's use of epithets: he might either control his own collection of examples by means of Professor Wetmore's Index to Vergil or Merguet's Lexicon zu Vergilius, assuming that these books are accurate and complete, or he might rely wholly upon Wetmore or Merguet, or both; by the latter method he would effect a great saving of time. The preparation of general lexicons, such as Harpers' Latin Lexicon, Karl Ernst Georges's Ausführliches Lateinisches-Deutsches Handwörterbuch (7th edition, Leipzig, Hahn, 1879-1880: two volumes, columns 2878+3210) or the great Thesaurus itself, or of such ambitious works as Neue-Wagener's Formenlehre der Lateinischen Sprache (Berlin, S. Calvary, 1892) or Krebs-Schmalz's Antibarbarus der Lateinischen Sprache (7th Edition, Basel, Benno Schwabe, 1905-1907) is absolutely or largely dependent, at least for exhaustiveness, on Indexes or special Lexica to individual authors. One has only to note, for instance, how inadequately Harpers' Lexicon and Georges both (especially the former) deal with Aulus Gellius to realize the helplessness of the maker of a general lexicon if he has no reliable index or special lexicon for a given author; see e.g. American Journal of Philology 14. 216-225, 16.52-65. Finally, the best Latin Grammar ever written is a good lexicon. For example, if one wishes to know how *prohibeo*, to take a simple illustration, behaves, let him turn to the best available dictionary; he will (or should) find together all the combinations used with this verb and will get indications of the range of each. Hence the most earnest students of syntax await with the utmost interest the appearance of the special lexica. Such books as Professor Bennett's Syntax of Early Latin. Vol. I. The Verb (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.6-7, 12-15) or Lindsay's Syntax of Plautus (Oxford, Parker, 1907) would have been at once easier to make and more complete had Professor Lodge's Lexicon Plautinum been finished and accessible.

On pages 9-13 of his dissertation Professor Wet-

more discusses the scope of his proposed lexicon; in most matters he found himself in agreement with Professor Lodge's practice. On pages 13 ff. he considers the arrangement of the examples. Two chief methods, he noted, are here possible: (a) the logical, by which the examples of the words are arranged according to meanings, as interpreted by the author of the lexicon, (b) the formal, by which the examples are arranged according to the inflectional forms of the words actually found in the author.

Against the logical method Professor Wetmore argued that it is throughout subjective; scholars often disagree concerning the meaning of a word, and are, indeed, at times wholly unable to decide definitely the sense of a given word (thus, asks Professor Wetmore, are *misero* in Aen. 2.738 and *toro* in Aen. 4.691 in the dative or in the ablative?). In Vergil, he continued, there is a further difficulty, in that, as has been often noted, the words are saturated repeatedly with second meanings: see, for example, in this connection the Index to my edition, under Suggestiveness of Vergil's Language, page 579. In endeavoring to group according to meanings the examples of a word apparently so simple as *fluvius*, Professor Wetmore found himself unable in at least five instances (out of a total of 38) to fix definitely its sense. He determined, therefore, to follow the formal method, modifying, however, largely the method as previously employed. Then, on pages 24-28, he gave the article on *fluvius* as it was to appear in his projected Lexicon to Vergil. The article fell into four parts: I Form; II Metric; III Usage; IV Modifiers. Under I the material was admirably presented, being set down twice, once in a running statement, then in tabular form. Under II it was stated e.g. that 16 out of the 37 (38) examples form the latter part of the third foot and the first part of the fourth foot. Under III the examples of the singular were kept entirely separate from those of the plural. Such severance at times has undoubted advantages, e.g. in connection with such a word as *cervix* (see Harpers' Lexicon) or such a discussion as we find in Gellius 19.8. The examples of the accusative singular were arranged under four heads: accusative in apposition with the subject <i.e. as predicate accusative in connection with an infinitive>, as object, with prepositions, in apposition <i.e. in apposition with a (direct) object, of verb or preposition>. The instances of the accusative as object were arranged according to the alphabetical order of the governing verbs. Under IV interesting matter was brought together, under two heads: genitive modifiers (1 example), adjectival modifiers (14).

The exact method adopted by Professor Wetmore in this article and in the other specimen articles which complete his book had not been employed in any pre-

vious lexicon. Parts of it, however, had been used; thus, Professor Lodge had followed the plan of grouping at the close of an article the modifiers of the word under review. He had also planned to give such metrical information as Professor Wetmore purposed to give, but had been obliged to abandon the plan. Plautus's test is far less certain than Vergil's.

Admirable as Professor Wetmore's plan was, it nevertheless had, to my mind, serious disadvantages (but what mundane plan has not?). I sympathize heartily with what he says about the subjective character of all attempts at classification by meanings. But Mr. Wetmore's method makes a lexicon of far less value to any one save the expert who knows the author through and through, so that unassisted he can interpret the material presented. Driven to an extreme, such a method makes a lexicon so-called an index, valuable, yes, but far less valuable than it might be, than it ought to be to the great majority. The Lexicon Petronianum is an instance in point; it is of little help to most students of Petronius, an author full of *crucis*. Furthermore, this method would, I am sure, be a constant temptation to shirk part of the duties which, in practice, have been incumbent on lexicographers—the determination of meanings (compare the words of Professor Rand, below): it would be possible to prepare a lexicon on such a plan with but an imperfect apprehension of an author's meaning. Assuming, however, that the author of a special lexicon makes the profound studies which he ought to make, the careful studies that Professor Wetmore had made for his specimen articles, who is better qualified than he to help others to an understanding of his author's meaning? Why should he forego such an opportunity to help others? why should he allow the major part of his work to go for naught, so far as others are concerned? why should he not give us his subjective interpretation of his author? is it any more wrong, any less valuable for him to do this than it is for the editor of the text, in critical or exegetical edition, to give us an interpretation of the author which is inevitably subjective? I find myself, therefore, in agreement with Professor Rand, in his review of Professor Wetmore's Index, when he says (Classical Philology 6,378): "The <logical method> involves a study of the meanings of words, and that is the chief end of a lexicon . . . categories of the definite could be established, and a general rubric include the indeterminate".

I trust, however, that no one will think me insensible of the enormous value that would have attached to Professor Wetmore's lexicon, had he worked it out according to the plan he so carefully elaborated and so admirably presented in his dissertation.

Fate, however, dealt most harshly with Profes-

sor Wetmore and with lovers of Vergil—aye, with all students of the Classics. Copies of his dissertation were widely distributed; the work was noticed in well-known periodicals in Germany as well as in this country. Since no one notified him that he had planned or wished to plan a similar work, Professor Wetmore went on with his contemplated Lexicon. I quote now from the Preface to the Index:

In May, 1909, when about one thousand pages of the manuscript were ready for the press, the announcement was received that H. Merguet, to whom a copy of my publication had been sent in February, 1905, was about to begin the publication of a Lexicon zu Vergilius. With limited time and resources it seemed useless to continue a work which could not be completed until some time after the demand for a lexicon to Vergil's works had been met. It was thought best therefore to abandon the cherished plan and to issue this index instead.

CHARLES KNAPP.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE

In connection with the editorial in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.73 may I remind you that The American Journal of Archaeology publishes archaeological discussions *twice* a year, and archaeological news *twice*, in addition to a bibliography? In other words Numbers 1 and 3 publish News, Numbers 2 and 4 Discussions. Number 2 always has the Bibliography.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA. WILLIAM N. BATES.

THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The 104th meeting of The Classical Club of Philadelphia was held on Friday evening, December 13, 1912. The main paper, by Dr. G. B. Colburn, of the University of Missouri, was read in the absence of the author by the Secretary. It discussed the Noises of Ancient Rome, taking as a text the references in the satirists to urban noise and uproar. These complaints, Dr. Colburn held, are largely satirical stock in trade. The noises were personal, not mechanical. The conclusion reached was that "ancient Rome, while more noisy than Athens, was not a noisy town in the modern acceptance of the term. Its sounds were rather those of Venice than of New York . . . The average citizen was probably not subject to nervousness from this source". Dr. E. W. Burlingame gave some interesting examples of onomatopoeia from Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali literature.

B. W. MITCHELL, Secretary.

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The second luncheon of The New York Latin Club will be held on *Saturday, February 8* (not February 1, as originally arranged) at The Gregorian, 35th St., New York City. Dr. B. W. Mitchell, of the Central High School, Philadelphia, will address the Club.